



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/456,689	12/09/1999	MICHAEL S. PASIEKA	PHA23871	6774

24737 7590 11/12/2003

PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS
P.O. BOX 3001
BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510

EXAMINER

PARTHASARATHY, PRAMILA

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2133

DATE MAILED: 11/12/2003

7

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/456,689	PASIEKA, MICHAEL S.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Pramila Parthasarathy	2133

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 4/23/2003.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 13 March 2000 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|--|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ . |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) <u>2 and 5</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ . |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-17 is presented for examination.

2. ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2.1. Claims 1-5, 13, and 15 -17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Abadi et al. (US Patent No. 5,173,939).

As per Claims 1, 16, and 17 Abadi et al. teaches a method for controlling access to the information by maintaining a control list or contact list to determine which entities is authorized to communicate with the given entity (Col.1 Lines 62-68). Abadi also teaches the use of a membership table or list to add entities that are allowed to communicate with the given object or entity (Fig 4 Col. 9 Lines 53-55). Those of ordinary skill in the art will recognize this can easily be implemented as a revocation list by adding entities that are not allowed to communicate with the given entity.

As per Claim 2, Abadi et al. teaches the given entity and one other entity to comprise a consumer electronics device (Fig. 1 and Col 3. Lines 36-40).

As per Claim 3, Abadi et al. teaches maintaining and utilizing steps are implemented in an access control system (Col. 1 Lines 62-68).

As per Claim 4, Abadi et al. teaches the use of membership table or list in the access control system (Col. 2 Lines 4-11). Those of ordinary skill in the art will recognize this can easily be implemented as a local revocation list with entities that are not allowed to access.

As per Claim 5, Abadi et al. teaches the control or contact list comprising a plurality of entities, each entry including a principal or entry or identifier and a type of access or revocation flag associated with the entity (Col. 5 Lines 33-35 and Col.7 Lines 53-55).

As per Claim 8, Abadi et al. teaches the advantages of updating the membership or contact list if an entity is to be removed (Col. 4 Lines 26-34). Those of ordinary skill in the art will recognize this can easily be implemented to updating the contact list if new entity attempts to communicate with the given entity.

As per Claim 13, Abadi et al. suggests the methods to provide security using encryption and digital signature techniques are well known (Col. 1 Lines 47-49).

As per Claim 15, Abadi et al. teaches a subset of other entities stores a contact list having entries corresponding to entities which have attempted to communicate with each other (Col. 1 Lines 62-68).

3. *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3.1. Claims 6, 7, 9 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Abadi (5,173,939) in view of Kingdon (5,677,851).

As per claim 6, Abadi et al. does not disclose updating the contact list after modification of the revocation list. However, Kingdon discloses a method for modifying an object or entity by adding or deleting a value to the associated attribute of the entity (see col.5 Lines 36-39) and Kingdon discloses a method for synchronizing the associated attribute to update the contact list (see col.5 Lines 40-43). Therefore, it would be obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify Abadi by including therein synchronizing and modifying procedure as taught by Kingdon. Such modification would have been obvious because by updating the contact list after a modification of the revocation list the list would have the most current entries.

As per claim 7, Abadi et al. discloses a method for identifying all the entities for each distant type of access associated or revocation flag set in the object or contact list (Col.5 Lines 33 – 35). Abadi does not disclose a method for updating the contact list. However, Kingdon discloses a method for

- (a) adding a value to the associated attribute of the entity by adding a value to such an attribute;
- (b) synchronizing the associated attribute
- (c) Updating the contact list (see col.5 Lines 36-39).

Therefore, it would have been obvious for those ordinary skill in the art to implement the claimed invention by storing an entity identifier and setting the corresponding revocation flag for the new entity in the contact list if there is sufficient space available

As per claim 9, Abadi et al. discloses limitations of Claim 8. But, Abadi does not disclose updating the contact list if a new entity is not already included in the contact list. However, Kingdon discloses a method to

- (a) verify if the new entity is stored in the contact list
- (b) determine if the new entity is included in the contact list
- (c) update the contact list (see col. 5 Lines 36-43).

As per claim 14, Abadi et al. does not disclose a method for updating the digital signature each time the contact list is updated. Kingdon as discussed above describes the method for updating the contact list (Col. 5 Lines 36-43). Therefore, it would be obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to implement the claimed invention by updating the digital signature each time the contact list is updated.

3.2. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Abadi (5,173,939) in view of Perlman (5,687,235).

As per claim 12, even though **Abadi et al.** teaches limitations of Claim 5, Abadi does not disclose a method wherein the revocation flag of a particular entry may not be cleared as long as that entry remains in the contact list. However, Perlman discloses that the entry should not to be cleared as long as the entry remains in the contact list (see col. 7 Lines 10-18 and Lines 49-55). Therefore it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to implement the claimed invention by not modifying the revocation flag as long as that entry remains in the contact list to provide an efficient and secure way of managing the contact list.

3.3. Claims 10 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Abadi (5,173,939) in view of Kingdon (5,677,851) and further in view of De Jesus (5,832,206).

As per claim 10, while Abadi and Kingdon teach the limitations of Claim 9, they fail to disclose a method to select a particular entry of the contact list for removal. De Jesus, however, discloses a method to select an entry from the contact list (See Fig. 2B-42). Therefore, it would be obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to implement selecting an entry from the contact list as taught by De Jesus because doing so will avoid removing an entity with the revocation flag set from the contact list.

As for claim 11, De Jesus discloses a method to implement random or pseudo-random selection process. (See Col.10 Lines 48-50).

Conclusion

4. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Wobber et al. (5,235,642), relates to controlling access to computer resources in a distributed computer system, and particularly to apparatus and methods for making such access control systems more efficient by locally caching in each computer authentication credentials for principals requesting use of that computer's resources.

Van Oorschot et al. (5,699,431), relates to managing lists of revoked certificates, by partitioning them into smaller segments thereby allowing the maximum potential size of any one segment to be kept arbitrarily small, and allowing efficient processing of lists according to revocation reasons.

5. Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks, Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to: (703) 872-9306 for all formal communications.

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA, Fourth Floor (Receptionist).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Pramila Parthasarathy whose telephone number is 703-305-8912. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00a.m. To 5:00p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Albert Decady can be reached on 703-305-9595. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

Guy J. Lamare
for

Albert DeCady
Primary Examiner

****[Signature]*